REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Various pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,740,893 (Buchholz). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As to amended claim 1, Buchholz nowhere discloses determining whether a first portion of a register has been updated, and if so setting an indicator bit of an update indicator storage within a second portion of the register to indicate the update. Instead, Buchholz teaches a system in which a separate register (i.e., a vector status register) is updated when a different register (i.e., one of a vector register) is updated. To the extent that the Office Action contends that somehow the vector status register is the register that is updated and of which an indicator bit is set, nowhere does Buchholz anywhere teach determining whether any portion of the vector status register has been updated and if so, setting a bit in another portion of the vector status register. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable.

For similar reasons, the remaining independent claims and the claims depending therefrom are similarly patentable.

Pending claims 31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Buchholz. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The claims are patentable for the further reason that nowhere does Buchholz teach or suggest that the register for which a determination of update status is made is a control register. Instead, Buchholz merely discloses that the registers analyzed for update status are vector registers used for vector processing. Buchholz, col. 5, lns. 45-67. Accordingly, claims 31 and 33 are patentable over the §103 rejection for these further reasons.

Pending claims 34 and 36-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Buchholz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,737 (Russell). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. This rejection is improper at least for the same reasons discussed above regarding the failure of Buchholz as a §102 reference. This rejection is further improper, at least because Russell nowhere teaches or suggests clearing an indicator bit upon occurrence of a context switch. Instead, Russell merely teaches that certain information may be written into a register (i.e., a meta virtual machine register) upon activating an execution environment -- it does not teach clearing information, and certainly not an indicator bit, on a switch. Russell, col. 7, ln. 39 – col. 8, ln. 29.

Pending claims 35, 42, and 43 stand rejected under §103(a) over Buchholz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,671 (Dynarski). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. This rejection is improper at least for the same reasons discussed above regarding the failure of Buchholz as a §102 reference. Furthermore, as to these claims nowhere does either reference teach or suggest reducing power consumption of a battery-operated device by refraining from transferring register contents. Nor is there any basis to combine the vector processor of Buchholz with Dynarski, which is directed to a network access server.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 19, 2005

Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906
Attorneys for Intel Corporation